General Resolutions.

Resolution No. 1.

MR. G. B. RAGHAVENDRACHAR moved the following resolution:—

"That this Assembly recommends to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja that as many subjects, resolutions, etc., remain undiscussed during the Birthday and Dasara sessions, an extra annual session be convened in the month of February, every year."

In doing so, he pointed out that the resolution as sent up by him had suggested the holding of the extra session in Bangalore instead of Mysore, which point was omitted in the printed resolution.

THE SECRETARY, REPRESENTATIVE ASSEMBLY, replied that that addition could be made.

MR. RAGHAVENDRACHAR explained that a review of the previous proceedings of the Assembly revealed the following lapses for want of time:—

	Birthday Session of 1927		Dasara Session of 1927	
	Number on the agenda	Number not taken up	Number on the agenda	Number not taken up
Questions	46	16	73	16
Representations	92	64	121	67
Resolutions	9	2	..	..

It was thus clear that more than 50 per cent of the questions and 70 per cent of the representations could not be taken up owing to the limited time allowed for the non-official business. Under the existing Regulation the duration of the Dasara and Birthday sessions was fixed at 8 and 6 days respectively, even though the Reforms Committee had contemplated three sessions annually and recommended 15 days for the Dasara, 10 days for the Birthday and 5 days for the Special sessions. The members were not getting an opportunity to have their full say owing to the frequent interruptions of the official members in the course of their speeches. Thus the representatives could not do full

justice to the confidence placed in them by the voters and ventilate the public opinion before the Assembly.

With reference to the possible objection that a special session might entail heavy additional expenditure to Government, Mr. Raghavendrachar said that the cost for the two sessions together during the previous year was Rs. 28,000 and that if a special session were held at Bangalore, the entire cost might be brought within Rs. 12,000. Another advantage to the people would be that the Government could explain to the representatives the need for additional and supplementary demands which amounted last year to over Rs. 16 lakhs. At present such an opportunity was altogether denied to the Assembly. In this view, he commended the resolution to the favourable consideration of Government.

In supporting the resolution, MR. M. S. LINGE GOWDA represented that it was desirable to bring the non-officials into touch with Government once in every four months; that the gap of 8 months between the Dasara Session and the Birthday Session was too long and that one more session should be held in that interval. While the Legislative Council was meeting almost once in a quarter, he thought that an invidious treatment was being meted out to the Assembly. Seeing that the Assembly was after all a consultative body with no powers of even voting on the supplementary grants, he prayed that one more session should be sanctioned so that the desire of conferring with Government once in every four months might be fulfilled.

MR. B. L. BYANNA who sought the permission of the Chair to move his amendment* on the resolution of which due notice had already been given was ruled out of order as the wording of the amendment negatived the original proposition itself.

MR. B. S. PUTTASWAMI opposed the resolution on the ground that no useful purpose would be served by holding a third session so long as the powers of the Assembly remained what they were. He thought that the Assembly occupied the position of a Debating Society. Even though according to the spirit of the Constitutional Reforms, the opinion of the Assembly in respect of legislative measures and the resolu-

**Amendment to Resolution No. 1.*

In lines 3 and 4 *for* "an extra annual session be convened in the month of February every year" *substitute* "the time limit in each session be adequately extended just to obviate the existing difficulties."

Mover.—MR B. L. BYANNA.

tions passed in the House had to be respected, past experience showed that it was being floated. As instances, he quoted the Agricultural Relief Bill and an Amending Bill to the Registration Regulation placed before the Legislative Council against the adverse vote of the Assembly, and complained that even though their re-committal was suggested at the Legislative Council by certain non-official members, it was not heeded. There were also occasions, he said, when Government had not consulted the Assembly as regards the general principles of the Bills, *e.g.*, Bill to amend the Municipal Regulation, and that similarly the process fee was enhanced on the plea that it could be done by an executive order. He also cited another instance, *viz.*, the amendment of the Court Fee Regulation where the Assembly was consulted even though there was no necessity for it, to show that the policy in these matters did not seem to him to be consistent. He was therefore of opinion that no good would result from convening a new session of a powerless body at a heavy cost of Rs. 14,000 and that it should not be thought of till a stage was reached when the decisions of the Assembly would have a binding force on Government.

MR. N. G. SANJEEVIAH in supporting the resolution said that it should be noted that Mr. Puttaswamy was not opposed to the principle of the resolution but only made out a case for enhancing the powers of the Assembly. He described the difficulties of the members in getting their subjects, etc., accepted at the district meetings in the first place and after that if they were allowed to lapse for want of time in the Assembly, the constituents would obtain no benefit in sending their representatives to represent their grievances before the Government. He thought that the position of the members was very irksome and that the only remedy lay in holding a special session for the discussion of subjects that could not be taken up at the ordinary sessions.

MESSRS. DYAVAPPA GOWDA and GURUMURTIAHCARYA also emphasised the latter part of Mr. Sanjeeviah's contentions and added that either a special session should be held or the duration of each session should be extended so as to admit of all subjects being disposed of therein.

MR. Y. SRINIVASIENGAR opposed the resolution on the ground of cost and said that that money could with advantage be utilised for primary education. He was of opinion that the object of the resolution could be achieved at a

much less cost by lengthening the duration of the present sessions.

MR. SIDDALINGAPPA SETTY was also of the same opinion. If, however, members were prepared in the interests of their voters to attend the third session without claiming travelling allowances, he had no objection to a special session being held.

Referring to the opinion expressed by one of the opposers of the resolution MR. S. N. M. RAZVI enquired whether the additional session should be held after the enhanced powers were given to the Assembly or before it. With reference to the argument that the voters would be dissatisfied, he said that although the voters had asked some members to represent certain matters on their behalf, they did not apparently give an undertaking to them to see that these matters would be brought up for discussion in the Assembly. As regards the increase in expenditure, he was of opinion that it was worth while incurring it to satisfy the joint wishes of the Assembly. He also remarked that the printed proceedings were being curtailed from year to year, thus limiting the publicity to non-official views. He thought that a greater part of the agenda should be gone through provided the members curtailed their speeches and avoided repetitions. He also suggested that non-official business might be given precedence over official business unlike the present practice. In any case, he was anxious that the entire agenda should be gone through either by holding a third session or by extending the duration of the ordinary sessions.

MR. S. VENKATESIAH felt that the House was not satisfied with the time allowed to each member for discussion, with the preference shown to Government business, and with the limited scope for scrutinising the Budget. While admitting that some time was being wasted in prolonged discussions and repetitions, he said that it could not be avoided under the present level of enlightenment in the country, and added that under the existing limitations, the members had several handicaps in profiting fully by the privileges conferred by the Reforms.

As regards the suggestion to prolong the duration of the sessions instead of convening an additional one, he pointed out that members coming from the mofussils would be inconvenienced if they were required to absent themselves from headquarters for a longer time.

He therefore favoured the idea of a third session.

THE LEGAL REMEMBRANCER TO GOVERNMENT explained that the resolution before the House contemplated the creation of extra opportunities to the people's representatives for discussing a larger number of questions than at present. He was, however, surprised that Mr. B. S. Puttuswamiah characterised the Assembly as nothing more than a debating society where pious resolves were made without being fruitful of any results. He remarked that such an attitude exhibited a lack of appreciation on the part of the member of the boons conferred upon the Assembly by the gracious Proclamation of H. H. the Maharaja. The Constitutional Reforms of 1923 were, in his opinion, a memorable event in the annals of the history of Mysore. He was afraid that there was a lot of misconception on the part of the members about their rights and duties, and impressed on them the primary fact that the Assembly was purely a consultative body and that its decisions were not binding on the Government. He added that at best it was an advisory body and not a legislative body and wished that the members could realize the significance of the new right bestowed on them of moving resolutions in the Assembly on matters relating to public administration as well as on the annual State budget so as to influence the policy of Government in the best interests of the people. He observed that as matters stood, certain members had been wasting a lot of time by putting needless Supplementary Questions of an ingenious character without serious thought to the value of the information to be elicited. He had no doubt that a lot of time could be saved and the same used for getting through a larger volume of business, provided the members confined their attention to discussing relevant points and avoiding repetitions. He exhorted the members not to make objectional statements such as the one made by Mr. Puttaswamiah but to create healthy conventions for the future.

Referring to Mr. Puttaswamiah's criticism that Government set at nought the rights of the Assembly by failing to consult them in connection with the recent enhancement of the process fee, the Legal Remembrancer explained that the enhancement of the process fee was not in the nature of levying a new or additional tax, which required for its imposition the passing of a new Regulation or the amendment of an existing one, but increasing an existing fee for services rendered by Government and that the same could be done by an executive order of Government. Thus the need to consult the Assembly on that question did not arise, and

it was wrong to say that Government had erred in that instance.

It was also pointed out that originally the Representative Assembly had no recognised right of expressing its views as regards proposals for new or additional taxation but whereas they were now entitled to be consulted beforehand in those matters, besides asking questions and moving resolutions. He challenged the members to prove that the Constitutional Reforms did not mark a definite advance on the powers of the Assembly.

As regards the criticism that the duration of the Sessions of the Assembly was comparatively short, he referred the members to the duration of the sittings in a Province like Madras consisting of no less than 23 big districts, where the Legislative Council sat for only 35 days in the year and was able to get through a good portion of the business on the agenda both official and non-official while in Mysore the Representative Assembly and Legislative Council together sat for 29 days during the same period with comparatively less business got through. If such expeditious despatch of business was not possible in Mysore, he said the non-officials alone were to blame for the lack of any organisation on the lines obtaining elsewhere with leaders to voice the opinion of each school of thought.

On behalf of Government, he expressed the opinion that the idea of convening an additional session of the Assembly was not acceptable on financial grounds as each session would involve a heavy expenditure, the travelling allowance to non-official members alone amounting to Rs. 22,000 per year. As regards the question of extending the duration of each session he said that the Rules Committee had made certain suggestions which were under the consideration of Government.

In these circumstances, the Legal Remembrancer hoped that the House would not press the Resolution.

Mr. B. S. Puttaswamiah, while resenting the strong expressions of the previous speaker, explained that he was second to none in his loyalty to His Highness the Maharaja and that he was actuated by the best of motives in his criticisms and that it was up to Government to create the best traditions and healthy conventions.

The Dewan replied that the question of establishing healthy conventions depended more upon the Assembly, on how its members conducted themselves, than upon Government.

In the light of the explanation given, MR. G. B. RAGHAVENDRACHAR withdrew his resolution, with the permission of the House.

ADJOURNMENT MOTION

MR. V. VENKATAPPA (Channapatna) moved an adjournment motion relating to the large percentage of failures in the recent Lower Secondary Examination. In doing so, the member said that some years ago the question of abolishing the Lower Secondary as a public examination had received the serious attention of the public and that Mr. C. R. Reddy, the then Inspector-General of Education, favoured that idea. Still he was sorry that that examination was being continued. A huge slaughter was going on from year to year in the results of that examination. Out of 5,400 candidates who sat for it in 1927, only 2,225 came out successful, giving a percentage of 40·6 against 44·2 per cent in the year preceding it. During the current year out of 9,200 pupils sent up for the English Lower Secondary Examination, only 37 per cent passed. What was the reason for such a large failure, the member asked. In his opinion, it should be attributed to one of the following several causes:—

(1) Low level of intelligence of the pupils ;

(2) deterioration of the teaching staff;

(3) lack of supervision on the part of the inspectorial staff ;

(4) stiffness of question papers ; and

(5) too much rigour in the valuation of the answer papers.

Under the new rule, if a candidate passed in English and failed to secure the passing marks in any other single subject, he was being declared as 'Eligible for admission into the IV Form.' This was not considered as a full pass. The new rule was the very reverse of the S.S.L.C. system, according to which a candidate under similar circumstances was being declared as 'Eligible for Public Service.'

Mr. Venkatappa also pointed out that the working rule during Mr. C. R. Reddy's time was that there should be no failure of any average student ; and that the percentage of passes then was 61 per cent. The sound principle then followed was that a student's progress up to the S.S.L.C. standard should not be impeded.

He, therefore, thought that heavy failures in the Lower

Secondary grade were opposed to the modern educational system and prayed that the results should be re-examined with a view to mitigate the lot of young pupils.

MR. H. B. GUNDAPPA, in supporting the adjournment motion, said that the question papers for the current examination were very stiff and much above the standard—especially those in English and Arithmetic. Failure at the examinations in the lower stages was sure to damp the enthusiasm of young boys and curb their spirits. He commended the practice obtaining in Japan where the pupil was not required to undergo the ordeal of passing a public examination in the elementary stages but had only to put in the required course. Under this system, Japan had advanced by leaps and bounds within the past 50 years and about 90 per cent of its people had become literate and to-day Japan was one of the foremost powers in the world.

He wanted the House to consider how the backward class pupils could improve if such a large number be discouraged every year in the examinations. There was little wonder, he said, that they had not made much headway in spite of the various other facilities created for their education. He was not prepared to admit the theory that there was a fall in the level of intelligence of the average boy. On the other hand, he thought that if the teachers had been conscientious in their work, the complaint would not have arisen. It was deplorable that even in the lower grades of the A. V. Schools, boys were made to stay on in the same class for two or three years, and he had no doubt that such a contingency would never arise if the teacher realised his main function of bringing into play the latent powers in his young pupils.

Referring to the system of education prevailing in the country, he dwelt at length on the severe strain involved on the unmatured brains in having to master a foreign language. Under the revised courses of study, every boy and girl had to learn English from the 1st A. V. class. Mr. Gundappa referred the House to the opinions of educationists that it was unnatural to subject a child to learn an alien language at such an early age. Besides, at the tender age of 12 or 13, the candidate appearing for the Lower Secondary Examination had in addition to studying English as a language had to master several other subjects. He opined that too much importance was attached to the study of English in the schools.

He said that the masses did not very much care for

certificates but merely wanted their children to become literate and that Government should not attach too much importance to the marks obtained at the examinations.

THE THIRD MEMBER OF COUNCIL remarked that though the speaker was belittling the usefulness of the English language, the generality of opinion did not support that view ; that he disagreed with him in thinking that a boy of 12 or 13 was not fit to learn a foreign language ; and asked whether the standard of education would not suffer by giving wholesale promotions to the students. Referring to Mr. Gundappa's remark that the results of public examinations were not a real test of a pupil's intelligence, he pointed out that that statement was a contradiction in terms as revealed by the object of the adjournment motion brought up for discussion. The examination was meant to test a candidate's knowledge and if those below the mark were not detained, the pupils were bound to suffer seriously in the University stage. He did not believe that there would be any real advantage in passing the undeserving pupils and pointed out that the existing rules were elastic in so far as those who passed in English and Arithmetic could secure admission into the High School class.

In these circumstances, the member was of the opinion that no strong case had been made out for reconsidering the results of the examination as contemplated in the adjournment motion.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION explained that there was no sudden fall in the percentage of passes as would be evident from the following figures :—

1925	..	..	.. 43 per cent
1926	..	..	.. 34 „
1927	..	..	.. 41 „
1928	..	..	.. 37½ „

The low percentage in the current year he said, was due to the new moderation system, which had not been standardised all these years. The question was discussed at great length by the Local Examinations Board which consisted of both official and non-official members, who appointed a special committee to decide upon the basis of calculating the marks for moderation. The latter committee arrived at an understanding that not more than 3 marks in English and 5 marks in other subjects need be allowed for purposes of moderation, whereas in earlier years the grace marks had been more generous.

As there had been a complaint about the question

papers in English and Arithmetic, the Director said that the examiners were instructed to be lenient in the valuation. Besides, grace marks had been given to pupils who were on the border of a pass. Even as matters stood he pointed out that there was a complaint from the High School Head Masters that the material supplied by the Lower Secondary schools was not good. He also added that on academical grounds it was not a sound policy to give high grace marks just to raise the percentage of passes, and that the pupils so promoted would not be fit for High School work.

As regards the high standard of the question papers complained against, the Director of Public Instruction explained that it was proposed to remedy this defect in the future years by selecting Middle School Head Masters as examiners. A committee had been appointed to go into the question of the standard of papers set this year and action would be taken on their report. Lastly, there was already a provision for really hard cases. The Director was empowered, under existing rules, to exempt from passing Lower Secondary Examination such candidates as were recommended on their general performance at the examination by the Head Masters, for admission to the IV Form in their schools. In view of the general complaint about some of the papers this year, the power under this provision would be exercised generously.

In conclusion he deprecated discussion of such subjects in popular assemblies, as it would have an undesirable effect on students who might be led to think that the results of examinations would be decided on other grounds than educational and be influenced by pressure brought to bear on the Department at such assemblies.

MR. D. S. MALLAPPA said that it was understood from the speech of the Director of Public Instruction that the main cause for the miserably low percentage of passes was the change in the old system of valuation. While more than half of the number that appeared in 1924 had come out successful, it was to be regretted that only a third passed the examination during the year under consideration. It was opposed to psychological laws to pluck such a large number of young pupils in the examination.

He requested Government to adopt the sound policy laid down by Mr. C. R. Reddy who arrived at the decision after mature deliberation.

MR. S. VENKATESAIAH attributed the large failures to the small number of Middle Schools in the State and the

consequent over-crowding therein making it impossible for the teacher to bestow individual attention on the students. He also agreed that there was a complaint about the poverty of the material sent up for the S.S.L.C. examination. He, however, thought that the question of re-valuation might be considered and the percentage of passes increased during the current year.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION replied that as recommendations were received from the Head Masters, they would be considered favourably as far as possible.

MR. M. C. LINGE GOWDA mentioned that the then Inspector-General had not made a secret of the fact that the Lower Secondary Examination was taxing the brains of the youth severely and that it should be done away with as soon as all the Middle Schools were properly manned. Now that the system of posting graduates at the head of these schools had begun, he said that it was high time that the public examination was abolished.

He was also of the opinion that the teachers who were actually handling the Lower Secondary classes should be appointed as examiners so that the questions set might not over-reach the standard and that in declaring the results due regard should also be paid to the progress of the pupil in the class.

In regard to the first suggestion, THE THIRD MEMBER OF COUNCIL replied that the re-staffing of Middle Schools was still in a transitory stage and that it would take some time to bring in good results.

The resolution was thereupon by leave withdrawn.

The House then adjourned to meet again the next day.